UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/852,609	05/09/2001	Carlos A. Serrano-Morales	60000-0014	4894

7590   04/22/2004

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker, LLP
1600 Willow Street
San Jose, CA 95125-5106

EXAMINER
HOLMES, MICHAEL B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2121	

DATE MAILED: 04/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>(3)</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 May 2001</u> .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>2-7, 12, 14-19, & 24</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10 September 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – WWW.USPTO.GOV

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1.   This action is responsive to application **09/852,609**, filed **May 09, 2001**.

2.   **Claims 1-24** have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

3.   Examiner acknowledges applicants' submission of prior art and information disclosure.

Nevertheless, applicant is respectfully remind of the ongoing Duty to disclose 37 C.F.R. 1.56

all pertinent information and material pertaining to the patentability of applicant's claimed in-

vention, by continuing to submitting in a timely manner PTO-1449, Information Disclosure

Statement (IDS) with the filing of applicant's of application or thereafter.

Drawings

4.   The formal drawings have been reviewed by the United States Patent & Trademark

Office of Draftperson's Patent Drawings Review.

Specification

5.   The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence

of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is required in correcting any errors of which

applicant may become aware in the specification. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objection

6.   **Claims 2-7, 12, 14-19, & 24** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base

claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim Interpretation

7.   Office personnel are to give claims their **"broadest reasonable interpretation"** in light

of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28

(Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not

read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551(CCPA

1969). See *also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322(Fed. Cir. 1989)

("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms

reasonably allow. . . . The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be

amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clari-

fication imposed. . . . An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are

precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be

removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process."). *see* MPEP § 2106

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> **(e) the invention was described in a patent** granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

9.   The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999

(AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002

do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA

35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

10.   **Claims 1, 9, 11, 13, 21, & 23-24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by **Aldrich (USPN 6,615,198 B1), Filed: April 10, 2000; Date of Patent: September 2, 2003.**

Regarding claim 1:

Aldrich teaches,

A method for developing rules applications, wherein the method comprises the computer

implemented steps of:

generating a first template that defines a rules structure for rules that may be executed by a rules

engine; [**FIG. 1; (col. 5, line 50 to col. 6, line 14** *"The STC 112 is used to create solution tools*

for systems, devices, or processes. The STC 112 has a component panel used to define

components that would be used to define requirements for a solution when the solution tool is

used, an options panel used to define potential selections for components, and a <u>rules engine</u>

used to build logic that, when used, builds a solution of requirements for components according

to options selected for questions. Optionally, the STC 112 may have a graphic engine to

associate graphics with components and an assembly panel used to define properties for

components, graphics, and logic. Preferably, only the super-user 106 has access to the STC 112.

The solution tool 114 comprises selections, graphics, including component graphics and

<u>template</u> graphics, component identifications, and logic <u>rules</u>*. When the solution tool 114 is*

used by the user 104, the logic <u>rules</u> operate to present the questions and options, process the

options, dynamically build one or more component list reports identifying components required

for the solution, i.e. the solution requirements, as the user selects options to the questions,

dynamically build one or more graphic reports depicting the solution requirements as the user

selects options to the questions, and present hyperlinks that can connect the user to training

media or to the online help. Optionally, the solution may have one or both of the component list

report or the graphic report, and the hyperlinks may be included or excluded for any particular

option. ***Only one solution tool 114 is shown in the Figures for clarity. However, multiple***

solution tools may exist, and one or more of the solution tools may be downloaded and used by

a user.") **& (col. 9, line 12-19** *"****For example, a first solution to the solution tool 230 may have***

a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of component graphics,

template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help*. A second solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.")]*

generating a second template describing a first set of tasks that includes a first task and an association with said task and said first template; **[(col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to the solution tool 230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.* ***A second solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.****")]*

generating a set of rules based on said first template, wherein said association between said first task and said first template causes execution of said set of rules by said rules engine while executing said first task. **[FIG. 1; (col. 5, line 62 to col. 6, line 13** *"The solution tool 114 comprises selections, graphics, including component graphics and* <u>template</u> *graphics, component identifications, and logic* <u>rules</u>*. When the solution tool 114 is used by the user 104, the logic* <u>rules</u> *operate to present the questions and options, process the options, dynamically build one or more component list reports identifying components required for the solution, i.e. the solution requirements, as the user selects options to the questions, dynamically build one or more graphic reports depicting the solution requirements as the user selects options to the questions, and present hyperlinks that can connect the user to training media or to the on-line help. Optionally, the solution may have one or both of the component list report or the graphic report, and the*

hyperlinks may be included or excluded for any particular option. **Only one solution tool 114 is shown in the Figures for clarity. However, multiple solution tools may exist, and one or more of the solution tools may be downloaded and used by a user.***")* **&** **(col. 9, line 21-35** *"The interpreted solution tool code 232 dynamically builds a solution based upon selected options as the options are selected for the questions in the solution tool 230. Therefore, as questions are presented to the user and options are selected, the interpreted solution tool code 232 selects a template graphic that corresponds to the total solution and adds component graphics to the template graphic to build a graphic report based upon individual selected options as those options are selected. Thus, for example, after options are selected for three questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with two component graphics corresponding to two required components. Whereas, for example, after options are selected for five questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with three component graphics corresponding to three required components.***")]*

Regarding claim 9:

Aldrich teaches,

The method of claim 1, wherein said second template is a ruleflow template describing tasks that entail execution of rules. **[(col. 7, line 22-44** *"The logic rules 220 include the rules engine used by the super-user to create solution tools. The rules engine is a simple, easy to use point-and-click control pad with logic buttons that allows a super-user to create the logic rules that determine requirements for a solution based upon selected options to questions in a solution tool. The rules engine has a base set of logic buttons with operators that can be used to create*

any logic statements or logic rules needed to implement any solution. The logic statements and

logic rules are created by clicking on logic buttons, components listed in the component list,

selections, and graphics. Once the logic rules and logic statements are created, the rules engine

dynamically converts the created logic rules to assembled logic in an assembled logic format

(solution tool code) that can be used to complete a solution tool once interpreted, even if the

solution tool is not completed and ready for use. The logic rules 220 are saved as part of a

created solution tool on the solution system database 214 as the solution tool code. This format

allows a solution tool, including the logic rules, to be saved in an easy to save and transmit

format that requires a relatively small amount of storage space. Many solution tools require less

than five hundred kilo bytes of storage.") **& (col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to*

the solution tool 230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first

subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.

A second solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with

their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to

training media, and on-line help."")]

Regarding claim 11:

Aldrich teaches,

A method for developing software that involves the execution of rules by a rules engine, wherein

the method comprises the computer implemented steps of:

generating a group of rule templates that define rules structure for rules that may be executed by

said rules engine; **[(col. 7, line 50-67** *"The solution tool 226 is any solution tool that can be used*

by a user to determine requirements for a solution to a process, a device, or a system. The

solution tool 226 includes logic rules saved in the assembled logic format, graphics, selections,

*and components. **Although only one solution tool 226 is depicted in FIG. 2, multiple solution***

***tools can exist.** The solution tool 226 resides in two forms. Prior to being downloaded by a user,*

the solution tool 226 has solution tool code with assembled logic that was created by the super-

user. Associated with the assembled logic are the selections that list the questions and the

available options or entries for the questions and an identification of components that may be

*required for any potential solution. **Also part of the solution tool are template graphics and***

component graphics that are associated with each possible selection that can be made. After

being downloaded by a user, the solution tool 230 is interpreted by the interpreter 228 as

***described more fully below. ")** & (col. 9, line 12-19 "For example, a first solution to the*

solution tool 230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first

subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.

***A second solution to the solution tool** may have a second subset of selected components with*

their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training

media, and on-line help.")]

generating a first ruleflow template that defines:

a first set of tasks that includes a first task, and an association with said first task and a group of

rule templates; **[(col. 9, line 12-19 "*For example, a first solution to the solution tool 230 may*

have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of component

graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help. A second solution*

to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their associated

second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-

line help.")]

generating a second ruleflow template that defines:

a second set of tasks that includes a second task, an association with said second task and said

group of rule templates; **[(col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to the solution tool*

230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of

component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help. **A second**

solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their

associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training

media, and on-line help.")] and

generating a set of rules based on said group of templates, wherein said association between said

first task and said group of templates causes execution of said set of rules by said rules engine

while executing said first task, **[(col. 9, line 21-35** *"The interpreted solution tool code 232*

dynamically builds a solution based upon selected options as the options are selected for the

questions in the solution tool 230. **Therefore, as questions are presented to the user and options**

are selected, the interpreted solution tool code 232 selects a template graphic that corresponds

to the total solution and adds component graphics to the template graphic to build a graphic

report based upon individual selected options as those options are selected. *Thus, for example,*

after options are selected for three questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic

with two component graphics corresponding to two required components. Whereas, for example,

after options are selected for five questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with

three component graphics corresponding to three required components.")] and

wherein said association between said second task and said group of templates causes execution

of said set of rules by said rules engine while executing said second task. [(**col. 9, line 21-35**

"The interpreted solution tool code 232 dynamically builds a solution based upon selected

*options as the options are selected for the questions in the solution tool 230. **Therefore, as***

questions are presented to the user and options are selected, the interpreted solution tool code

232 selects a template graphic that corresponds to the total solution and adds component

graphics to the template graphic to build a graphic report based upon individual selected

options as those options are selected. *Thus, for example, after options are selected for three*

questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with two component graphics

corresponding to two required components. Whereas, for example, after options are selected for

five questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with three component graphics

corresponding to three required components.")]

Regarding claim 13:

Aldrich teaches,

A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for developing

rules applications, wherein execution of the one or more sequences of instructions by one or

more processors causes the one or more processors to perform the steps of:

generating a first template that defines a rules structure for rules that may be executed by a

rules engine; [(**col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to the solution tool 230 may*

have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of component

graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help. A second solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.")]

generating a second template describing a first set of tasks that includes a first task and an association with said task and said first template; [(col. 9, line 12-19 *"For example, a first solution to the solution tool 230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help. A second solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.")]*

generating a set of rules based on said first template, wherein said association between said first task and said first template causes execution of said set of rules by said rules engine while executing said first task. [(col. 9, line 21-35 *"The interpreted solution tool code 232 dynamically builds a solution based upon selected options as the options are selected for the questions in the solution tool 230. Therefore, as questions are presented to the user and options are selected, the interpreted solution tool code 232 selects a template graphic that corresponds to the total solution and adds component graphics to the template graphic to build a graphic report based upon individual selected options as those options are selected.* Thus, for example, after options are selected for three questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with two component graphics corresponding to two required components. Whereas, for example, after options are selected for five questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with*

three component graphics corresponding to three required components.")]

Regarding claim 21:

Aldrich teaches,

The computer-readable medium of claim 13, wherein said second template is a ruleflow template describing tasks that entail execution of rules. **[(col. 7, line 22-44** *"The logic rules 220 include the rules engine used by the super-user to create solution tools. The rules engine is a simple, easy to use point-and-click control pad with logic buttons that allows a super-user to create the logic rules that determine requirements for a solution based upon selected options to questions in a solution tool. The rules engine has a base set of logic buttons with operators that can be used to create any logic statements or logic rules needed to implement any solution. The logic statements and logic rules are created by clicking on logic buttons, components listed in the component list, selections, and graphics. Once the logic rules and logic statements are created, the rules engine dynamically converts the created logic rules to assembled logic in an assembled logic format (solution tool code) that can be used to complete a solution tool once interpreted, even if the solution tool is not completed and ready for use. The logic rules 220 are saved as part of a created solution tool on the solution system database 214 as the solution tool code. This format allows a solution tool, including the logic rules, to be saved in an easy to save and transmit format that requires a relatively small amount of storage space. Many solution tools require less than five hundred kilo bytes of storage.")* **& (col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to the solution tool 230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media,*

and on-line help. A second solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected

components with their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics,

hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.")]

Regarding claim 23:

Aldrich teaches,

A computer-readable medium carrying one or more sequences of instructions for developing

software that involves the execution of rules by a rules engine, wherein execution of the one or

more sequences of instructions by one or more processors causes the one or more processors to

perform the steps of:

generating a group of rule templates that define rules structure for rules that may be executed by

said rules engine; [(**col. 7, line 50-67** *"The solution tool 226 is any solution tool that can be used*

by a user to determine requirements for a solution to a process, a device, or a system. The

solution tool 226 includes logic rules saved in the assembled logic format, graphics, selections,

*and components. **Although only one solution tool 226 is depicted in FIG. 2, multiple solution***

***tools can exist.** The solution tool 226 resides in two forms. Prior to being downloaded by a user,*

the solution tool 226 has solution tool code with assembled logic that was created by the super-

user. Associated with the assembled logic are the selections that list the questions and the

available options or entries for the questions and an identification of components that may be

*required for any potential solution. **Also part of the solution tool are template graphics and***

***component graphics that are associated with each possible selection that can be made.** After*

being downloaded by a user, the solution tool 230 is interpreted by the interpreter 228 as

described more fully below. ") & **(col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to the*

solution tool 230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first

subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help.

A second solution to the solution tool *may have a second subset of selected components with*

their associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training

media, and on-line help.")]

generating a first ruleflow template that defines:

a first set of tasks that includes a first task, and an association with said first task and a group of

rule templates; **[(col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to the solution tool 230 may*

have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of component

graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help. *A second solution*

to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their associated

second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-

line help.")]

generating a second ruleflow template that defines:

a second set of tasks that includes a second task, an association with said second task and said

group of rule templates; **[(col. 9, line 12-19** *"For example, a first solution to the solution tool*

230 may have a first subset of selected components with their associated first subset of

*component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training media, and on-line help. **A second***

solution to the solution tool may have a second subset of selected components with their

associated second subset of component graphics, template graphics, hyperlinks to training

media, and on-line help.")] and

generating a set of rules based on said group of templates, wherein said association between said

first task and said group of templates causes execution of said set of rules by said rules engine

while executing said first task, [(**col. 9, line 21-35** *"The interpreted solution tool code 232*

dynamically builds a solution based upon selected options as the options are selected for the

questions in the solution tool 230. ***Therefore, as questions are presented to the user and options***

are selected, the interpreted solution tool code 232 selects a template graphic that corresponds

to the total solution and adds component graphics to the template graphic to build a graphic

report based upon individual selected options as those options are selected. *Thus, for example,*

after options are selected for three questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic

with two component graphics corresponding to two required components. Whereas, for example,

after options are selected for five questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with

three component graphics corresponding to three required components.")] and

wherein said association between said second task and said group of templates causes execution

of said set of rules by said rules engine while executing said second task. [(**col. 9, line 21-35**

"The interpreted solution tool code 232 dynamically builds a solution based upon selected

options as the options are selected for the questions in the solution tool 230. ***Therefore, as***

questions are presented to the user and options are selected, the interpreted solution tool code

232 selects a template graphic that corresponds to the total solution and adds component

graphics to the template graphic to build a graphic report based upon individual selected

options as those options are selected. *Thus, for example, after options are selected for three*

questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with two component graphics

corresponding to two required components. Whereas, for example, after options are selected for

five questions, the graphic report may have a template graphic with three component graphics

corresponding to three required components.")]

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   **Claims 8-13 & 10-22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Aldrich (USPN 6,615,198 B1), Filed: April 10, 2000; Date of Patent: September 2, 2003,

in view of

Karck (USPN 6,442,537 B1), Filed: Jun. 24, 1999; Date of Patent: Aug. 27, 2002.

The *Aldrich* has been discussed above and does not explicitly teach the limitations of

claims 8-13 & 10-22. However *Karck* teaches the limitations of claims 8-13 & 10-22.

Regarding claim 8 & 13:

Karck teaches,

The method of claim 1, wherein said first template is a rule template. **[FIG. 1; (col. 1, line 66 to**

col. 2, line 3 *"FIG. 1 shows a high level conceptual diagram of a rules systems in accordance with the present invention. FIG. 1 includes a template rule library which consists of a plurality of predetermined template rules which have application in a variety of fields."*)] It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a rule template which allows for generic rules to be customized and utilized in specific environments on a dynamic and specific basis.

Regarding claim 10 & 22:

Karck teaches,

The method of claim 1, wherein said first template describes a structure of a business rule.

[(**col. 2, line 6-11** *"One such situation would be an employee information database, wherein columns related to an employee's extension at work and other innocuous data may be accessable to most or all other employees, but sensitive data such as salary, health history, home address, etc. would only be available to certain qualified employees."*)] It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matters pertains, to employ a rule template which allows for generic rules to be customized and utilized in a business environment and on a dynamic and specific basis.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and (listed of form **PTO-892**) not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure as follows. Applicant or applicant's representative is respect-

fully reminded that in process of patent prosecution i.e., amending of claims in response to a

rejection of claims set forth by the Examiner per Title 35 U.S.C. The patentable novelty must be

clearly shown in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited and any objections

made. Moreover, applicant or applicant's representative must clearly show how the amendments

avoid or overcome such references and objections. *See* **37 CFR § 1.111(c)**.

Correspondence Information

12.   Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Michael B. Holmes** who may be reached via telephone at

(703) 308-6280. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between

8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding After Final

issues, please send it to **(703) 746-7238**. If you need to send an Official facsimile trans-

mission, please send it to **(703) 746-7239**. If you would like to send a Non-Official (draft)

facsimile transmission the fax is **(703) 746-7240**. If attempts to reach the examiner by tele-

phone are unsuccessful, the **Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight,** may be reached at

(703) 308-3179.

Any response to this office action should be mailed too:

Director of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231. Hand-delivered

responses should be delivered to the Receptionist, located on the fourth floor of

Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive Arlington, Virginia.

Michael B. Holmes
Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121
United States Department of Commerce
Patent & Trademark Office